DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 041 TM 002 856

AUTHOR Ryans, David G.
TITLE Similarities and Differences in Teacher Characteristics among Ethnic Groups Represented in the United States.
PUB DATE Feb 73
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at annual meeting of National Council on Measurement in Education (New Orleans, Louisiana, February 25-March 1, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Classification; Cognitive Processes; *Comparative Analysis; *Ethnic Groups; *Rating Scales; Social Adjustment; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Characteristics; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

The focus of this paper is on groups of teachers classified according to self-reported national and/or racial heritage. The problem studied was simply notation of similarities and differences among mean scores of groups of in-service teachers in the U.S.A. when the teachers were so classified. Ss were over 3,000 in-service teachers from the 50 states. These teachers completed the Teachers Characteristics Schedule G-70/2, which makes available 11 scales relating to teacher behaviors, attitudes, educational viewpoints, cognitive responses, and personal social adjustment. Results are given in tabular form. It is concluded that group differences in mean scores on the scales do exist. (CK)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078041

TM 002 856

D. G. Ryans
February, 1973
New Orleans
AERA/NCME

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AMONG ETHNIC GROUPS REPRESENTED IN THE UNITED STATES

David G. Ryans

Education Research and Development Center

University of Hawaii

Groups similarities and differences in behavior are of scientific and popular interest for describing and understanding the worlds--physical, biological, psychological, and sociological--in which man lives and with which each person interacts.

Such behavioral similarities and differences are of even greater importance in relation to changes that may be desirable from the standpoint of social, humanistic, political, or other type of values and of ways of identifying salient characteristics of different groups, the operational description of such characteristics, and ways of attempting to bring about desired change.

Indeed, all would agree that this is the major objective of education--to try to effect change in individuals that will enhance the likelihood that they will appropriately (a) contribute to the society in which they live and (b) lead personally satisfying lives. The ways and means of enhancing mans' potential to the fullest possible extent provide the rationale from which not only educators, psychologists, and sociologists, but also all of the scientific community proceed in trying to learn more of similarities and differences among groups of people.

The bases for grouping persons upon which studies of similarities and differences have focussed are many, e.g.: age; sex; mores, customs, traditions, etc. associated with national and/or racial heritage; life styles, customs, mores, etc. associated with financial and/or cultural level

TM 002 856

Education Research and Development Center

University of Hawaii

Groups similarities and differences in behavior are of scientific and popular interest for describing and understanding the worlds--physical, biological, psychological, and sociological--in which man lives and with which each person interacts.

Such behavioral similarities and differences are of even greater importance in relation to changes that may be desirable from the standpoint of social, humanistic, political, or other type of values and of ways of identifying salient characteristics of different groups, the operational description of such characteristics, and ways of attempting to bring about desired change.

Indeed, all would agree that this is the major objective of education--to try to effect change in individuals that will enhance the likelihood that they will appropriately (a) contribute to the society in which they live and (b) lead personally satisfying lives. The ways and means of enhancing mans' potential to the fullest possible extent provide the rationale from which not only educators, psychologists, and sociologists, but also all of the scientific community proceed in trying to learn more of similarities and differences among groups of people.

The bases for grouping persons upon which studies of similarities and differences have focussed are many, e.g.: age; sex; mores, customs, traditions, etc. associated with national and/or racial heritage; life styles, customs, mores, etc. associated with financial and/or cultural level (i.e., socioeconomic); occupation; and hundreds of other categorizations.

The general group with which this study was concerned was teachers--in-service teachers.

Next, the concern, which provides the title of the paper, was with groups of teachers classified according to self-reported national and/or racial heritage. For each participating teacher, data were available on scales of the revised Teacher Characteristics Schedule G-70/2, purportedly reflecting some widely accepted major characteristics of teachers. The score of each teacher on each scale was classified according to self-

reported national and/or racial heritage and mean scores, together with related statistics, computed.

At this point, it is significant to keep in mind several facts that are well known but often passed by.

First, when one deals with averages for groups, individual members of the groups lose their identity as individuals--a corollary being that there actually is substantial overlapping of scores from one group to another.

A second point is that national/racial life styles, customs, etc. sometimes are found to be co-occurring and confounded with life styles, customs, mores, etc. associated with financial conditions and intellectual/cultural interests of homes in which children are raised. Particularly important, there may be common or perhaps underlying conditions that are reflected in the group differences under consideration here. True, statistical techniques are available for ferretting out the effects of some of these interactions; this will be mentioned later.

In the case of teacher groups, there also are noteworthy differences in mean teacher characteristics' scores when the same teachers are classified with regard to different variables. Thus, differences in mean score among groups classified re racial-national heritage may be partly a result of typically disproportionate numbers of female vs. male teachers and of lower-grade vs. higher-grade teachers in the schools--and the fact that the mean scores of such contrasted groups differ for number of observable teacher characteristics. The sample

First, when one deals with averages for groups, ...

of the groups lose their identity as individuals--a corollary being that there actually is substantial overlapping of scores from one group to another.

A second point is that national/racial life styles, customs, etc. sometimes are found to be co-occurring and confounded with life styles, customs, mores, etc. associated with financial conditions and intellectual/cultural interests of homes in which children are raised. Particularly important, there may be common or perhaps underlying conditions that are reflected in the group differences under consideration here. True, statistical techniques are available for ferretting out the effects of some of these interactions; this will be mentioned later.

In the case of teacher groups, there also are noteworthy differences in mean teacher characteristics' scores when the same teachers are classified with regard to different variables. Thus, differences in mean score among groups classified re racial-national heritage may be partly a result of typically disproportionate numbers of female vs. male teachers and of lower-grade vs. higher-grade teachers in the schools--and the fact that the mean scores of such contrasted groups differ for number of observable teacher characteristics. The sample studied here is represented by over twice as many women as men teachers; and teachers of grades K through 6 constitute about 50% of the total with grades 7 through 9 teachers and grades 10 through 12 teachers about the same in number (the 10th-, 11th-, 12th-grade teachers number slightly more than the grades 7 through 9 group). Consider these proportions in relation to the following data. Mean scores of women teachers are fairly generally significantly superior to the mean scores of male teachers with respect to: warmth; originality, imaginativeness, stimulation; approving attitude toward pupils and others; permissive educational viewpoints; dedication to teaching; verbal-semantic facility; and frankness--also in regard to importance of value placed on religion; work and conformance; and altruism. The mean scores of men teachers, on the other hand, are superior of those of women with regard to:

businesslike, organized, task-oriented behavior; traditional academic educational viewpoints; personal social adjustment--and importance of value placed upon individual effort; success and prestige; and competition. With regard to level of grades taught, teachers of lower grades are generally higher (significantly) with respect to: warmth; approving attitudes toward pupils; permissive behavior; dedication to teaching; verbal-semantic facility--and importance of value placed on religion; change, innovation, and liberalism; work and conformance; and altruism. Teachers of the higher grades are superior to those of lower grades with respect to: businesslike, organized, task-oriented behavior; original, imaginative, stimulating behavior; traditional academic educational viewpoints; and logical judgment--and importance of value placed upon individual effort; success and prestige; and competition.

Probably of even greater significance are the confounding of effects of ethnic lineage and (a) "financial conditions of home and family when teacher was a child" and (b) "intellectual-cultural background of family when teacher was a child." For the national sample, with respect to "financial status of childhood home," six of 11 F's with regard to scales reflecting teaching behaviors, attitudes, etc. and five of the eight F's relating to values were highly statistically significant. With respect to "childhood intellectual-cultural conditions" reported by teachers of the national sample, nine of the 11 F's relating to scales estimating teaching behaviors, attitudes, etc. and seven of the eight F's relating to values were statistically significant at a high level. (Categories of "childhood home's finances" ranged from "poverty or near poverty" to "financially

attitudes toward pupils; permissive behavior; dedication to teaching; verbal-semantic facility--and importance of value placed on religion; change, innovation, and liberalism; work and conformance; and altruism. Teachers of the higher grades are superior to those of lower grades with respect to: businesslike, organized, task-oriented behavior; original, imaginative, stimulating behavior; traditional academic educational viewpoints; and logical judgment--and importance of value placed upon individual effort; success and prestige; and competition.

Probably of even greater significance are the confounding of effects of ethnic lineage and (a) "financial conditions of home and family when teacher was a child" and (b) "intellectual-cultural background of family when teacher was a child." For the national sample, with respect to "financial status of childhood home," six of 11 F's with regard to scales reflecting teaching behaviors, attitudes, etc. and five of the eight F's relating to values were highly statistically significant. With respect to "childhood intellectual-cultural conditions" reported by teachers of the national sample, nine of the 11 F's relating to scales estimating teaching behaviors, attitudes, etc. and seven of the eight F's relating to values were statistically significant at a high level. (Categories of "childhood home's finances" ranged from "poverty or near poverty" to "financially secure and well-off;" and categories of "cultural interest in childhood home" ranged from "no interest or concern about educational/cultural matters; few books, little reading or cultural discussion" to "great interest, concern with, and participation in cultural and educational matters; books, learning, etc. considered very important." The teachers were classified into four groups with respect to childhood home finance and five groups with regard to childhood home culture.) These data will not be discussed in detail, but teachers reporting they came from more affluent and more intellectually-culturally oriented families yielded mean scores significantly higher than other groups with respect to: "original, imaginative, stimulating" teacher behavior;

"verbal-semantic facility;" and "logical judgment," among others. Teachers from childhood homes that were reported as "high" with respect to extent of childhood home's cultural interest also attained the highest mean on the scale, "dedication to teaching." With regard to values held, mean scores of teachers from childhood homes of low cultural interest were highest with respect to value placed on change and innovation, material goods and possessions, and success and prestige; while teachers from homes of "above average" and "high" cultural interests yielded highest mean scores with regard to value placed on religion, work and conformance, altruism, and competition. Here, again, are examples of other kinds of group differences that, in this sample at least, may be confounded with national-racial heritage group differences.

Finally, in this list of cautions about interpretation of the data which follow, it must be kept in mind that a high or a low score on any one of the "teacher behavior, attitude, educational viewpoints, etc." scales or the "value" scales of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule has no meaning in terms of "goodness" or "badness" except to the extent a particular person, or group of persons, believes the characteristic reflected by the particular scale is an important one for teachers to possess. For example, some persons believe "warm, friendly" teacher behavior and perhaps "permissive educational viewpoints" are of great importance for teachers and possibly that "traditional-academic educational viewpoints" are undesirable teacher characteristics. In such a case, a high score on such scales as those relating to teacher "warmth" and "permissiveness" would signify to persons holding such

held, mean scores of teachers from childhood homes of low cultural interest were highest with respect to value placed on change and innovation, material goods and possessions, and success and prestige; while teachers from homes of "above average" and "high" cultural interests yielded highest mean scores with regard to value placed on religion, work and conformance, altruism, and competition. Here, again, are examples of other kinds of group differences that, in this sample at least, may be confounded with national-racial heritage group differences.

Finally, in this list of cautions about interpretation of the data which follow, it must be kept in mind that a high or a low score on any one of the "teacher behavior, attitude, educational viewpoints, etc." scales or the "value" scales of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule has no meaning in terms of "goodness" or "badness" except to the extent a particular person, or group of persons, believes the characteristic reflected by the particular scale is an important one for teachers to possess. For example, some persons believe "warm, friendly" teacher behavior and perhaps "permissive educational viewpoints" are of great importance for teachers and possibly that "traditional-academic educational viewpoints" are undesirable teacher characteristics. In such a case, a high score on such scales as those relating to teacher "warmth" and "permissiveness" would signify to persons holding such beliefs "goodness" on the part of such teachers, and a high score on the "traditional-academic educational viewpoints" scale would signify a less desirable teacher. Perhaps most persons would agree that "original, imaginative, stimulating" teacher behavior and "dedication to teaching" were generally desirable for all teachers. But for many characteristics estimated by the scales, parents, school administrators, curriculum planners, teachers, and pupils likely would disagree, perhaps even more among themselves than as groups, as to which characteristics typify the "good" or "effective" teacher, and, therefore, what higher or lower mean scores might suggest about the suitability or nonsuitability of a teacher.

This relativity, of which I often have spoken and written over the past 25 years, about the "goodness" or "poorness" to be attributed to behavioral characteristics is even more recognizable in the scales relating to the value domain. Is a high mean score on the scale reflecting value placed on "change, innovation, liberalism in policy and action" good, bad, or indifferent? Is a high mean score on the scale reflecting high value placed on "work and conformance" desirable or undesirable? Is a high mean score on the scale reflecting high value placed upon "material possessions" or "success and prestige" or perhaps "competition" desirable, undesirable, or of no importance? These are decisions to be reached by individuals or groups of individuals, and they will differ.

All we are attempting to do here is to present the mean scores of several national-racial lineage groups on the scales of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule; no judgments of the desirability or undesirability of any of the characteristics is made because of their relativity.

Problem

The problem attacked in this study was simply notation of similarities and differences among mean scores of groups of in-service teachers of U. S. A. (1971-72 data) when the teachers were classified by self-reported national and/or racial background.

Subjects

In Table 1, certain data are reported for each of four samples. The samples dealt with in this paper are Sample I, consisting of 3,248 in-service teachers from the 50 states of the United States of America, and Sample II, which consists of 3,552 in-service teachers and includes the teachers in Sample I plus 304 in-service teachers from the State of

reflecting value placed on "change, innovation, liberalism in policy and action" good, bad, or indifferent? Is a high mean score on the scale reflecting high value placed on "work and conformance" desirable or undesirable? Is a high mean score on the scale reflecting high value placed upon "material possessions" or "success and prestige" or perhaps "competition" desirable, undesirable, or of no importance? These are decisions to be reached by individuals or groups of individuals, and they will differ.

All we are attempting to do here is to present the mean scores of several national-racial lineage groups on the scales of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule; no judgments of the desirability or undesirability of any of the characteristics is made because of their relativity.

Problem

The problem attacked in this study was simply notation of similarities and differences among mean scores of groups of in-service teachers of U. S. A. (1971-72 data) when the teachers were classified by self-reported national and/or racial background.

Subjects

In Table 1, certain data are reported for each of four samples. The samples dealt with in this paper are Sample I, consisting of 3,248 in-service teachers from the 50 states of the United States of America, and Sample II, which consists of 3,552 in-service teachers and includes the teachers in Sample I plus 304 in-service teachers from the State of Hawaii. These teachers completed the Teacher Characteristics Schedule G-70/2. The group invited to participate in the national sample comprised a stratified random sample of teachers (approximate proportionate sampling with respect to sex, grade level taught, and state in which teaching was being conducted). Of the respondents in the national sample, 70% were women, 30% men; 51% taught in elementary schools, 49% in secondary schools; with regard to lineage, 84% said they were of "European" American heritage (i.e., ancestory, either remote or immediate, traceable to some European country), 10% marked "Negro American," 3% marked "Mexican American" and approximately 1% marked "American Indian," 1%

"American Japanese," and 1% "American Chinese." (These percentages are approximations and numbers of respondents noted in Table 1.) In the Hawaii teacher sample, 85% were women, 15% men; 60% were elementary teachers and 40% secondary teachers; and with regard to lineage 54% said they were "American Japanese," 22% said they were "American European," 11% said they were "American Chinese," 6% said they were "American Hawaiian," 2% said they were "American Filipino," 2% said they were American of other Asian background, and 2% said they were "Negro American." Sample II is included here primarily to permit broader comparisons of similarities and differences--largely through the substantial addition in number of "American Japanese" and also increases in numbers of "American Chinese" and "American Hawaiian" teachers. However, inclusion of the Hawaii in-service teacher sample was not simply a matter of addition of individuals who were completely similar to their "mainland" national-racial heritage counterparts. For example, the Hawaii sample (Sample III on Table 1) was significantly higher than Sample I with respect to: warmth; approval of pupils et al; permissive educational viewpoints; value placed upon change; and value placed upon materialism. Sample I was significantly higher than the Hawaii sample (Sample III) with respect to: traditional educational viewpoints; verbal/semantic facility; logical judgment; value placed upon religion; value placed upon work and conformance; value placed upon individual effort; value placed upon altruism; value placed upon prestige; and value placed upon competition. The samples were large and significant differences easy to achieve.

At any rate, these two groups, identified in Table 2 comprise the

said they were "American Japanese," 22% said they were "American [illegible] pean," 11% said they were "American Chinese," 6% said they were "American Hawaiian," 2% said they were "American Filipino," 2% said they were American of other Asian background, and 2% said they were "Negro American." Sample II is included here primarily to permit broader comparisons of similarities and differences--largely through the substantial addition in number of "American Japanese" and also increases in numbers of "American Chinese" and "American Hawaiian" teachers. However, inclusion of the Hawaii in-service teacher sample was not simply a matter of addition of individuals who were completely similar to their "mainland" national-racial heritage counterparts. For example, the Hawaii sample (Sample III on Table 1) was significantly higher than Sample I with respect to: warmth; approval of pupils *et al*; permissive educational viewpoints; value placed upon change; and value placed upon materialism. Sample I was significantly higher than the Hawaii sample (Sample III) with respect to: traditional educational viewpoints; verbal/semantic facility; logical judgment; value placed upon religion; value placed upon work and conformance; value placed upon individual effort; value placed upon altruism; value placed upon prestige; and value placed upon competition. The samples were large and significant differences easy to achieve.

At any rate, these two groups, identified in Table 2 comprise the subjects for whom data on national-racial lineage groups are reported.

Procedure

The new *Teacher Characteristics Schedule* is an updated and extended revision of the original *Teacher Characteristics Schedule* developed in connection with the original Teacher Characteristics Study in the 1950's. Reports of this study were made in a number of journals and also in a book (Ryans, 1960).

In developing the revised *Teacher Characteristics Schedule*, the intercorrelations of 2,000 teachers' responses (1,184 responses) to 450 items were factor-analyzed. (The techniques employed were conceived by Dr. Paul Horst and adopted to the present project in his

capacity as consultant to the Education Research and Development Center.) Following derivation of the scales based upon factor analysis of the responses, the score of each teacher in the 2,000 sample employed for development was obtained on each of the scales. As a second step, the biserial correlation between each response in a scale and the total score on that scale was obtained. This second culling was profitable in that it enabled the elimination of responses that overlapped among several of the scales derived directly from factor analysis of the responses.

In the original Teacher Characteristics Study the scorable responses for a scale purporting to estimate teacher behaviors, were obtained after a number of replications involving correlating Teacher Characteristics Schedule responses of teachers with "assessments of teacher classroom behavior" of these same teachers--assessments made by trained observers who employed a reliable Classroom Observation Record (and Glossary); responses to the Schedule that correlated significantly with observers' assessments comprised the scoring keys employed. As was noted above, the scales of the revised Teacher Characteristics Schedule G-70/2 were obtained by factor analysis and thus employed an entirely different approach. The scales of the original Schedule and those that emerged in the more recent factor analysis approach corresponded surprisingly closely.

Eleven scales relating to teaching behaviors, attitudes, educational viewpoints, cognitive responses, and personal social adjustment are now available. These are noted in the first column of Table 1--and in more abbreviated descriptive terms in Tables 2 and 3.

In addition to the current revision of the Schedule consists of

score on that scale was obtained. This second culling was profitable in that it enabled the elimination of responses that overlapped among several of the scales derived directly from factor analysis of the responses.

In the original Teacher Characteristics Study the scorable responses for a scale purporting to estimate teacher behaviors, were obtained after a number of replications involving correlating Teacher Characteristics Schedule responses of teachers with "assessments of teacher classroom behavior" of these same teachers--assessments made by trained observers who employed a reliable Classroom Observation Record (and Glossary); responses to the Schedule that correlated significantly with observers' assessments comprised the scoring keys employed. As was noted above, the scales of the revised Teacher Characteristics Schedule G-70/2 were obtained by factor analysis and thus employed an entirely different approach. The scales of the original Schedule and those that emerged in the more recent factor analysis approach corresponded surprisingly closely.

Eleven scales relating to teaching behaviors, attitudes, educational viewpoints, cognitive responses, and personal social adjustment are now available. These are noted in the first colum. of Table 1--and in more abbreviated descriptive terms in Tables 2 and 3.

In addition to the current revision of the Schedule consists of terms hypothesized to reflect "life views" and "values" espoused by teachers--a feature that was not a part of the original circa 1950 Teacher Characteristics Schedule. From factor analysis of responses to "value statements" and subsequent response analysis to determine the correlation of each response to the scales yielded by factor analysis, eight value patterns emerged.

Reliabilities (alphas) for each scale and for each sample are shown in Table 1. Reliabilities of .75 to .82 were obtained for nine scales; from .66 to .74 for nine scales; and .58 for one scale. Although the Schedule G-70/2 scales and scoring keys were derived by factor

analysis of 1,184 possible responses, subsequent factor analysis of the 19 scales, after the score of each teacher had been obtained on each of the original scales, yielded six factors (Eigenvalues 4.38 to 1.08) suggesting these scales might be reduced to nine in number, each consisting of combinations of the original scales (some of the scales, of course, were bipolar). For nine scales reflecting related characteristics, reliabilities should be substantially higher than the reliabilities of the 19 scales noted earlier.

Analyses of variance were carried out with regard to several "classification" type items included in the Teacher Characteristics Schedule. One of these classification items reads, "How do you prefer to identify yourself with respect to your racial and/or national background?" (Mark only one response...) The question was followed by 15 categories, some of which were combined (e.g., "American of Hawaiian or principally Hawaiian extraction" and "Polynesian other than Hawaiian") for the analyses reported here. Eleven different groups with respect to national-racial lineage are included in Table 2.

Although as of now only one-way analyses of variance have been carried out later multi-dimensional analyses or other appropriate multi-variate techniques will be employed. It is hoped that at least two-way analyses of variance with sex of teacher controlled in one run, with grade level controlled in another, with financial status of home in another, with intellectual-cultural status controlled in another, etc. hopefully will be carried out and may reveal some interesting main effects and also interaction effects. However, when in 1971 multi-dimensional analyses of variance were used with still another sample of over 400 Hawaii teachers who had responded to the Teacher Characteristics Schedule,

of course, were bipolar). For nine scales reflecting related characteristics, reliabilities should be substantially higher than the reliabilities of the 19 scales noted earlier.

Analyses of variance were carried out with regard to several "classification" type items included in the Teacher Characteristics Schedule. One of these classification items reads, "How do you prefer to identify yourself with respect to your racial and/or national background?" (Mark only one response...) The question was followed by 15 categories, some of which were combined (e.g., "American of Hawaiian or principally Hawaiian extraction" and "Polynesian other than Hawaiian") for the analyses reported here. Eleven different groups with respect to national-racial lineage are included in Table 2.

Although as of now only one-way analyses of variance have been carried out later multi-dimensional analyses or other appropriate multi-variate techniques will be employed. It is hoped that at least two-way analyses of variance with sex of teacher controlled in one run, with grade level controlled in another, with financial status of home in another, with intellectual-cultural status controlled in another, etc. hopefully will be carried out and may reveal some interesting main effects and also interaction effects. However, when in 1971 multi-dimensional analyses of variance were used with still another sample of over 400 Hawaii teachers who had responded to the Teacher Characteristics Schedule, very few statistically significant interactions were revealed among the mean scores on the Teacher Characteristics Schedule scales when combinations of groupings by sex, grade level taught, and lineage or ethnic group were taken into account. "Japanese American" males showed a significantly higher mean score and "American European" males the lowest mean score with respect to "organized, task-oriented behavior." "American European" males attained a significantly higher mean score and "Japanese American" males the lowest mean score with regard to "stimulating, motivating, original" behavior. With respect to non-directive, permissive viewpoints, "American European" males attained the highest mean score, followed by

"Japanese American" females, "American European" females, and "Japanese American" males. "Hawaiian American" women teachers attained the highest mean score and "Japanese American" women teachers the lowest re general personal-social adjustment. We may again go as far as three-way analyses of variance in further studies of the current data, but I am somewhat doubtful because of the likelihood of many empty cells that may confuse inferences about the results and skepticism as to the meaningfulness of interaction effects when too many variables are involved.

Another question that may have been raised in some minds was why in this study there were not presented comparisons of mean scores of the 50-state national sample and the independent Hawaiian sample, as such. Shortness of time and lack of programming assistance is the explanation. (The program employed, because of the large number of empty cells with respect to the Hawaiian sample when national-racial classification was employed, provided printouts simply of "insufficient data." This is something that in time can be rectified.

Results

The results of the study, conducted as noted in preceding paragraphs, are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

For summary purposes, one may go directly to Table 3, "Lineage Groups of In-Service Teachers (with n > 30) Represented by Respondents' Scores Yielding Means Higher Than the General Mean (.05 level of significance) on Scales of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule G-70/2." For the scales reflecting teaching behaviors, attitudes, educational viewpoints, cognitive responses, and adjustment, significantly higher mean scores were attained by "American Japanese" on four scales (warmth; approval of pupils et al; permissive educational viewpoints; and "frankness"), by the "American Negroes" group on four scales (businesslike,

of variance in further studies of the current data, but I am somewhat doubtful because of the likelihood of many empty cells that may confuse inferences about the results and skepticism as to the meaningfulness of interaction effects when too many variables are involved.

Another question that may have been raised in some minds was why in this study there were not presented comparisons of mean scores of the 50-state national sample and the independent Hawaiian sample, as such. Shortness of time and lack of programming assistance is the explanation. (The program employed, because of the large number of empty cells with respect to the Hawaiian sample when national-racial classification was employed, provided printouts simply of "insufficient data." This is something that in time can be rectified.

Results

The results of the study, conducted as noted in preceding paragraphs, are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

For summary purposes, one may go directly to Table 3, "Lineage Groups of In-Service Teachers (with n > 30) Represented by Respondents' Scores Yielding Means Higher Than the General Mean (.05 level of significance) on Scales of the Teacher Characteristics Schedule G-70/2." For the scales reflecting teaching behaviors, attitudes, educational viewpoints, cognitive responses, and adjustment, significantly higher mean scores were attained by "American Japanese" on four scales (warmth; approval of pupils et al; permissive educational viewpoints; and "frankness"), by the "American Negroes" group on four scales (businesslike, task-oriented; traditional academic viewpoints; dedication to "teaching" and personal-social adjustment), and by the "American European" group on four scales (original, stimulating; verbal-semantic facility; "frankness;" and logical judgment); also by the "American Indian" on one scale (dedication to teaching), by the "American Chinese" on one scale (businesslike, task oriented), and by the "Mexican American" on one scale (traditional academic viewpoints). With regard to values, significantly higher mean scores were attained by the "Negro American" group on five scales (religion; change; material possessions; work and

conformance; and competition), by the "Japanese American" group on two scales (change; material possessions), by the "Mexican American" group on two scales (material possessions; individual effort) and by the "American Indian," the "Chinese American," the "American European" and the "Hawaiian American" on one scale each (work; material possessions; altruism; and change, respectively).

Rationales probably can be rather readily developed with respect to the trends revealed by the group means.

It is not emphasizing the point too greatly to mention still again that whether a high score is desirable, undesirable, or neutral--or whether a low score is desirable, undesirable, or neutral--in its importance as a reflection of a teacher characteristic--depends upon the reader and the variety of conditions that have entered into the reader's own perception of desired characteristics of teachers; it is a relative matter.

Should a reader be interested in comparing similarities of any two lineage groups, where the F is significant for a characteristic, he may resort to some of the widely used techniques for comparing the significance of differences among several means. Some very rough rules-of-thumb and generally on the ultra-safe side regarding avoidance of Type I errors are noted below:

Magnitude of Mean Difference for .05 Level of Significance

Group n	vs	Group n	Characteristics X through L (except AV)	Characteristic AV	Values Re through Co
30		50	2.6	3.4	2.3
		100	2.5	3.1	2.1
		200	2.4	2.9	1.9
		300	2.3	2.8	1.9
		2,500	2.2	2.7	1.8

"American Indian," the "Chinese American," the "American European" and the "Hawaiian American" on one scale each (work; material possessions; altruism; and change, respectively).

Rationales probably can be rather readily developed with respect to the trends revealed by the group means.

It is not emphasizing the point too greatly to mention still again that whether a high score is desirable, undesirable, or neutral--or whether a low score is desirable, undesirable, or neutral--in its importance as a reflection of a teacher characteristic--depends upon the reader and the variety of conditions that have entered into the reader's own perception of desired characteristics of teachers; it is a relative matter.

Should a reader be interested in comparing similarities of any two lineage groups, where the F is significant for a characteristic, he may resort to some of the widely used techniques for comparing the significance of differences among several means. Some very rough rules-of-thumb and generally on the ultra-safe side regarding avoidance of Type I errors are noted below:

Magnitude of Mean Difference for .05 Level of Significance

Group n	vs	Group n	Characteristics X through L (except AV)	Characteristic AV	Values Re through Co
30		50	2.6	3.4	2.3
		100	2.5	3.1	2.1
		200	2.4	2.9	1.9
		300	2.3	2.8	1.9
		2,500	2.2	2.7	1.8
50		100	2.1	2.8	1.7
		200	1.9	2.6	1.4
		300	1.8	2.4	1.3
		2,500	1.7	2.2	1.2
100		200	1.6	2.1	1.3
		300	1.4	1.9	1.2
		2,500	1.3	1.7	1.1
200		300	1.1	1.5	.8
		2,500	.9	1.3	.7
300		2,500	.7	.9	.6

Conclusions

An obvious conclusion is that there do appear to be differences, as well as similarities, among the mean scores of Teacher Characteristics Schedule scales across ethnic groups represented in the United States of America. At least, this appears to be the case based upon the sample of some 3,500 respondents who completed the Teacher Characteristics Schedule G-70/2. Many of the differences appear to make sense in terms of some stereotypes that have grown up regarding different national-racial groups. And rationales often can be developed in light of conditions fairly commonly agreed upon and changes that are taking place on the social scene--as well as in the thinking of educators, at all levels, about innovations and directions, educational content, processes, and requirements should take.

Group differences in mean scores on the scales do exist, regardless of overlapping among groups on all scales, of probable confounding effects of uncontrolled conditions, and of varying opinions of the relative desirability of a teacher possessing a particular characteristic. This fact leads back to the point made in the first paragraph, namely, that educators and the general public may well consider whether or not it is desirable to try to "even out" group differences among teachers. If the decision should be that an effort of this sort is desirable, approaches that may be hypothesized, developed, and evaluated in attempting to achieve that end must then be considered.

References

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers. Washington, D. C.; American Council on Education, 1960.

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF CONTRIBUTING RESPONSES, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND ALPHA COEFFICIENT FOR EACH SCALE (772 KE
OF THE TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS SCHEDULE (REVISION G-70/2)

Part 1: Scales Reflecting Teaching Behaviors, Attitudes, Educational Viewpoints, Cognitive Responses, and Adjustme

Scale of Teacher Characteristics Schedule (G-70/2)	Keyed Responses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) Ha In-Service Tea Sample	
		Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd
(X) "Warm, kindly (Concomitants of "considerate, kindly, friendly, good-natured (humanistic) teaching behavior")	73	23.1	7.0	.74	23.3	7.0	.74	24.4	6.8
(Y) "Businesslike" Task Oriented (Concomitants of "businesslike, thorough, organized, task-oriented teaching behavior")	75	26.8	7.3	.75	26.8	7.3	.74	26.2	6.8
(Z) Original, Stimulating (Concomitants of "imaginative, original, stimulating, motivating teaching behavior")	66	26.8	7.2	.79	26.8	7.1	.78	26.3	6.5
(R) Approving of Pupils and Others (Favorable opinions/attitudes about pupils and other persons contacted in schools)	54	31.0	5.6	.71	31.2	5.6	.71	32.6	5.8
(AV) "Traditional", Academic (Preference for educational viewpoints/ beliefs reflecting "teacher-directed, academic-centered school activities")	96	26.6	9.0	.82	26.4	9.0	.82	24.7	8.4
(PV) "Permissive", Non-directive (Preference for educational viewpoints/ beliefs reflecting "non-directive, unstructured, permissive school activities")	56	23.4	6.3	.75	23.5	6.3	.75	25.1	5.9

David G. Ryans
1972

TABLE 1

ESPONSES, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND ALPHA COEFFICIENT FOR EACH SCALE (772 KEYS)
OF THE TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS SCHEDULE (REVISION G-70/2)

Behaviors, Attitudes, Educational Viewpoints, Cognitive Responses, and Adjustment (1972 data)

Keyed Responses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) Hawaii In-Service Teacher Sample			IV. (N=441) Hawaii Student Teacher Sample		
	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}
73	23.1	7.0	.74	23.3	7.0	.74	24.4	6.8	.72	26.5	7.1	.74
75	26.8	7.3	.75	26.8	7.3	.74	26.2	6.8	.71	21.3	6.0	.66
66	26.8	7.2	.79	26.8	7.1	.78	26.3	6.5	.73	30.1	6.0	.68
54	31.0	5.6	.71	31.2	5.6	.71	32.6	5.8	.74	31.7	5.3	.68
96	26.6	9.0	.82	26.4	9.0	.82	24.7	8.4	.80	22.7	7.3	.75
56	23.4	6.3	.75	23.5	6.3	.75	25.1	5.9	.73	27.1	5.7	.70

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Scale of Teacher Characteristics Schedule (G-70/2)	Keyed Responses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) Ha In-Service Tea Sample	
		Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd
(TC) Dedicated to "Teaching" (Preference for viewpoints/beliefs reflecting "commitment or dedication to teaching; (professional involvement in teaching)")	54	29.1	6.7	.79	29.1	6.6	.79	28.9	5.8
(SP) Social/Personal Adjustment (Concomitants of "general personal/social adjustment")	44	17.5	4.9	.67	17.4	4.9	.67	17.2	4.8
(VS) Verbal/Semantic facility (Verbal-semantic facility (in language in which instruction is conducted); and preference for intellectual and cultural activities and viewpoints)	46	22.0	6.4	.79	21.9	6.4	.79	20.7	6.1
(V) "Frank" (in responding) (Validity of response (a response-set reflecting tendency to give responses that accurately describe the respondent's activities, preferences, opinions, etc.-- avoidance of preponderantly "socially desirable" responses))	41	23.9	4.5	.67	23.9	4.5	.67	24.3	4.5
(L) Logical, insightful judgments (Logical or "reasoned" judgments; concomitants of insightful thinking and judgment)	58	24.0	6.7	.76	23.9	6.6	.76	23.0	5.9

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Keyed sponses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) Hawaii In-Service Teacher Sample			IV. (N=441) Hawaii Student Teacher Sample		
	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}
54	29.1	6.7	.79	29.1	6.6	.79	28.9	5.8	.73	26.6	5.7	.72
44	17.5	4.9	.67	17.4	4.9	.67	17.2	4.8	.65	19.1	4.5	.60
46	22.0	6.4	.79	21.9	6.4	.79	20.7	6.1	.77	18.5	5.5	.71
41	23.9	4.5	.67	23.9	4.5	.67	24.3	4.5	.68	22.9	4.3	.64
58	24.0	6.7	.76	23.9	6.6	.76	23.0	5.9	.70	22.2	6.0	.71

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Part 2: Scales Reflecting "Life Views" or "Values"

Scale of Teacher Characteristics Schedule (G-70/2)	Keyed Responses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) H In-Service Te Sample	
		Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd
(Re) Religion and associated morality (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "religion (and religion associated morality, conventions and cultural tratitions)")	20	12.0	3.7	.77	12.0	3.7	.76	11.0	3.3
(Ch) Change, liberalism (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "innovation, change, and 'liberal' educational/social policy and action")	40	16.8	4.7	.74	16.9	4.6	.73	17.5	3.7
(Ma) Material well-being (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "self-gain; material well-being; (money-making; possessions; personal comfort)")	48	9.5	4.8	.72	9.6	4.8	.72	10.5	4.9
(WC) Work, and conformance (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "work; conformance; ethnocentricism; conservatism (also 'trustworthiness' and 'fairness')")	64	45.9	5.9	.76	45.8	5.8	.76	45.1	5.1
(Ind) Individual Effort (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "individual (vs. group) effort; independence of other persons in accomplishing tasks; self-dependency")	35	11.2	3.7	.58	11.2	3.7	.57	10.5	3.3

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Part 2: Scales Reflecting "Life Views" or "Values"

Keyed Responses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) Hawaii In-Service Teacher Sample			IV. (N=441) Hawaii Student Teacher Sample		
	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}
20	12.0	3.7	.77	12.0	3.7	.76	11.0	3.3	.68	8.6	3.4	.70
40	16.8	4.7	.74	16.9	4.6	.73	17.5	3.7	.61	20.8	4.2	.68
48	9.5	4.8	.72	9.6	4.8	.72	10.5	4.9	.72	11.1	4.8	.70
64	45.9	5.9	.76	45.8	5.8	.76	45.1	5.1	.68	44.0	6.2	.77
35	11.2	3.7	.58	11.2	3.7	.57	10.5	3.3	.51	10.9	3.5	.56

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Scale of Teacher Characteristics Schedule (G-70/2)	Keyed Responses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) Haw In-Service Teac Sample		
		Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r
(Al) Altruism (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "altruism; benevolence")	35	25.5	3.9	.67	25.4	4.0	.68	24.7	4.1	.
(Pr) Success, prestige (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "success; leadership; prestige")	32	11.7	3.9	.66	11.6	3.9	.66	11.0	3.7	.
(Co) Competition (Acceptance of statements reflecting value placed on "competition")	23	12.8	3.4	.66	12.7	3.4	.66	12.1	3.2	.

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Keyed Responses	I. (N=3,248) National Sample In-Service Teachers (50 states)			II. (N=3,552) Sample I plus 304 Hawaii In-Service Teachers			III. (N=304) Hawaii In-Service Teacher Sample			IV. (N=441) Hawaii Student Teacher Sample		
	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}	Mean	sd	r_{11}
35	25.5	3.9	.67	25.4	4.0	.68	24.7	4.1	.70	24.6	4.1	.69
32	11.7	3.9	.66	11.6	3.9	.66	11.0	3.7	.64	12.3	4.4	.73
23	12.8	3.4	.66	12.7	3.4	.66	12.1	3.2	.62	13.7	3.4	.67

David G. Ryans 2/15/73
"Similarities and Differen
Among Ethnic Groups Repres
America" NCME/AERA, New

TABLE 2
MEAN* TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS SCORES OF GROUPS OF IN-SERVICE TEACHERS OF U. S. A. (1971-72)
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO ETHNIC (RACIAL AND/OR NATIONAL) HERITAGE**
REPORTED BY RESPONDENT

TCS Scales Reflecting Teaching Behaviors, Attitudes, Educational Viewpoints, Cognitive Responses, and Adjustme

ETHNIC GROUPS (and P Levels of F for Samples I & II)	N	(X) "Warm", kindly	(Y) "Businesslike" Task Oriented	(Z) Original Stimulating	(R) Approving of Pupils, et al	(AV) "Traditional", Academic	(PV) "Permissive" Non-directive	(TC) Dedicated to "Teaching"	(SP) Social/Personal Adjustment	V S F
P Levels of F re Ethnic Groups										
I National Sample (50 states)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.008	.000	.522	
II National Sample plus independent Hawaii Sample		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.033	
AMERICAN INDIAN										
I	37	22.9	27.5	27.5	30.4	26.9	24.6	31.4	17.8	
II	38	22.8	27.4	27.4	30.6	26.9	24.4	31.2	18.0	
AMERICAN NEGRO										
I	322	20.5	31.3	24.4	31.2	29.1	22.7	32.1	18.4	
II	325	20.5	31.3	24.4	31.2	29.1	22.7	32.1	18.4	
CENTRAL/SOUTH AMER.										
I	14	19.9	29.9	23.9	29.1	33.7	22.3	30.2	18.1	
II	14	19.9	29.9	23.9	29.1	33.7	22.3	30.2	18.1	

*Means of groups re all scales are noted for interested readers; although two Sample I F's are not considered significant at an acceptable level and many n's are too small to be meaningful.
**No distinction made between immediate and remote heritage.

David G. Ryans 2/15/73 G-70/2 772 Keys
"Similarities and Differences in Teacher Characteristics Among Ethnic Groups Represented in the United States of America" NCME/AERA, New Orleans

TABLE 2

RISTICS SCORES OF GROUPS OF IN-SERVICE TEACHERS OF U. S. A. (1971-72)
D ACCORDING TO ETHNIC (RACIAL AND/OR NATIONAL) HERITAGE**
REPORTED BY RESPONDENT

haviors, Attitudes, Educational Viewpoints, Cognitive Responses, and Adjustments

(I) nal ating	(R) Approving of Pupils, et al	(AV) "Traditional", Academic	(PV) "Permissive" Non-directive	(TC) Dedicated to "Teaching"	(SP) Social/Personal Adjustment	(VS) Verbal-Semantic Facility	(V) "Frank" (in response)	(L) Logical, insightful judgment
00	.000	.000	.008	.000	.522	.001	.000	.000
00	.000	.000	.000	.000	.033	.000	.000	.000
.5	30.4	26.9	24.6	31.4	17.8	22.8	24.0	21.1
.4	30.6	26.9	24.4	31.2	18.0	22.6	23.8	21.1
.4	31.2	29.1	22.7	32.1	18.4	21.5	20.8	17.3
.4	31.2	29.1	22.7	32.1	18.4	21.6	20.8	17.3
.9	29.1	33.7	22.3	30.2	18.1	19.9	20.6	19.2
.9	29.1	33.7	22.3	30.2	18.1	19.9	20.6	19.2

ested readers; although two Sample I F's are not considered
re too small to be meaningful.
heritage.

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

ETHNIC GROUPS (and P Levels of F for Samples I & II)	N	(X) "Warm", kindly	(Y) "Businesslike" Task Oriented	(Z) Original Stimulating	(R) Approving of Pupils, et al	(AV) "Traditional", Academic	(PV) "Permissive" Non-directive	(TC) Dedicated to "Teaching"	(SP) Social/Personal Adjustment	V S F
AMER. "EUROPEAN"										
I	2,579	23.6	26.4	27.4	31.3	26.3	23.6	29.2	17.5	
II	2,645	23.6	26.4	27.5	31.3	26.2	23.7	29.2	17.5	
AMERICAN JAPANESE										
I	43	22.4	27.7	26.5	32.5	24.5	26.9	28.9	17.3	
II	205	24.3	26.6	25.9	32.7	24.7	25.8	28.5	16.8	
AMERICAN CHINESE										
I	19	22.3	28.4	26.5	30.5	29.6	23.3	27.8	16.2	
II	51	22.7	28.5	26.4	31.6	26.8	24.0	29.5	16.3	
AMERICAN FILIPINO										
I	5	29.8	21.6	27.4	33.0	20.6	28.2	29.0	18.2	
II	12	25.8	26.6	25.5	30.6	25.6	25.5	28.4	17.5	
AMER. PUERTO RICAN										
I	3	25.7	25.3	24.0	23.3	34.7	22.3	24.3	17.3	
II	4	26.3	27.0	21.5	28.0	32.3	22.3	26.5	17.5	
AMERICAN HAWAIIAN/ POLYNESIAN										
I	12	25.2	26.1	25.9	27.9	29.9	23.5	27.4	17.8	
II	31	23.8	26.7	27.3	31.9	26.4	24.7	30.3	18.9	
AMERICAN MEXICAN										
I	95	24.0	26.8	26.7	29.5	28.9	22.9	28.6	17.5	
II	97	24.1	26.6	26.8	29.5	28.8	23.0	28.5	17.5	
AMER. "ASIAN", other than noted above										
I	16	20.5	28.0	28.2	26.3	28.8	24.3	28.1	17.5	
II	24	22.0	26.3	26.7	27.1	27.4	24.0	27.6	18.0	

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

(Z) ginal ulating	(R) Approving of Pupils, et al	(AV) "Traditional", Academic	(PV) "Permissive" Non-directive	(TC) Dedicated to "Teaching"	(SP) Social/Personal Adjustment	(VS) Verbal-Semantic Facility	(V) "Frank" (in response)	(L) Logical, insightful judgment
27.4	31.3	26.3	23.6	29.2	17.5	22.5	24.5	25.3
27.5	31.3	26.2	23.7	29.2	17.5	22.4	24.6	25.3
26.5	32.5	24.5	26.9	28.9	17.3	20.5	24.4	22.7
25.9	32.7	24.7	25.8	28.5	16.8	20.3	24.8	23.1
26.5	30.5	29.6	23.3	27.8	16.2	19.6	23.4	23.3
26.4	31.6	26.8	24.0	29.5	16.3	20.7	23.2	22.1
27.4	33.0	20.6	28.2	29.0	18.2	20.8	23.4	23.6
25.5	30.6	25.6	25.5	28.4	17.5	20.5	22.3	20.3
24.0	23.3	34.7	22.3	24.3	17.3	17.3	26.0	23.7
21.5	28.0	32.3	22.3	26.5	17.5	20.5	25.5	23.7
25.9	27.9	29.9	23.5	27.4	17.8	19.9	20.3	19.3
27.3	31.9	26.4	24.7	30.3	18.9	20.4	21.6	19.5
26.7	29.5	28.9	22.9	28.6	17.5	20.8	22.5	20.8
26.8	29.5	28.8	23.0	28.5	17.5	20.8	22.5	20.9
28.2	26.3	28.8	24.3	28.1	17.5	19.8	21.8	23.4
26.7	27.1	27.4	24.0	27.6	18.0	19.0	20.9	23.1

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean
TOTAL OF 3,248 IN-SERVICE TEACHERS (Sample I)	23.1	7.0	26.8	7.3	26.8	7.2	31.0	5.6	26.6	9.0	23.4	6.3	29.1	6.7	17.5	4.9	22.0
TOTAL OF 3,552 IN-SERVICE TEACHERS (Sample II)	23.3	7.0	26.8	7.3	26.8	7.1	31.2	5.6	26.4	9.0	23.5	6.3	29.1	6.6	17.4	4.9	21.9

		Scales Reflecting "Life Views" and "Values"				
ETHNIC GROUPS (and P Levels of F for Samples I & II)	N	(Re) Religion and associated morality	(Ch) Change, liberalism	(Ma) Material well-being	(WC) Work, and Conformance	(Ind) Individual Effort	(Al) Altruism
P Levels of F re Ethnic Groups							
I National Sample (50 states)		.000	.006	.000	.000	.006	.015
II National Sample plus independent Hawaii Sample		.000	.002	.000	.000	.001	.000
AMERICAN INDIAN							
I	37	13.2	16.5	9.6	48.2	11.8	25.8
II	38	13.2	16.5	9.5	48.0	11.7	25.9
AMERICAN NEGRO							
I	322	13.8	17.6	10.8	48.2	10.6	25.5
II	325	13.8	17.6	10.8	48.2	10.7	25.5
CENTRAL/SOUTH AMER.							
I	14	13.2	16.0	11.9	46.1	13.4	23.7
II	14	13.2	16.0	11.9	46.1	13.4	23.7

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd
31.0	5.6	26.6	9.0	23.4	6.3	29.1	6.7	17.5	4.9	22.0	6.4	23.9	4.5	24.0	6.7
31.2	5.6	26.4	9.0	23.5	6.3	29.1	6.6	17.4	4.9	21.9	6.4	23.9	4.5	23.9	6.6

Scales Reflecting "Life Views" and "Values"

(Ch) Change, iberalism	(Ma) Material well-being	(WC) Work, and Conformance	(Ind) Individual Effort	(Al) Altruism	(Pr) Success, Prestige	(Co) Competition
.006	.000	.000	.006	.015	.833	.000
.002	.000	.000	.001	.000	.023	.000
16.5	9.6	48.2	11.8	25.8	11.2	13.5
16.5	9.5	48.0	11.7	25.9	11.3	13.6
17.6	10.8	48.2	10.6	25.5	11.8	14.1
17.6	10.8	48.2	10.7	25.5	11.8	14.1
16.0	11.9	46.1	13.4	23.7	12.1	12.4
16.0	11.9	46.1	13.4	23.7	12.1	12.4

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

ETHNIC GROUPS (and P Levels of F for Samples I & II)	N	(Re) Religion and associated morality	(Ch) Change, liberalism	(Ma) Material well-being	(WC) Work, and Conformance	(Ind) Individual Effort	(Al) Altruis
AMER. "EUROPEAN"							
I	2,579	11.9	16.7	9.2	45.7	11.3	25.7
II	2,645	11.9	16.7	9.2	45.6	11.2	25.7
AMERICAN JAPANESE							
I	43	10.6	18.1	10.9	45.9	10.8	24.6
II	205	10.3	17.6	11.0	45.0	10.4	24.3
AMERICAN CHINESE							
I	19	11.8	16.5	12.4	45.9	11.7	24.1
II	51	11.6	17.1	11.7	46.2	11.1	24.6
AMERICAN FILIPINO							
I	5	11.8	18.2	7.4	45.0	9.4	27.6
II	12	11.8	17.8	9.8	46.0	12.2	25.7
AMER. PUERTO RICAN							
I	3	8.6	19.7	16.7	41.7	11.3	21.3
II	4	9.8	19.3	12.3	42.3	11.0	21.0
AMERICAN HAWAIIAN/ POLYNESIAN							
I	12	11.0	18.8	12.2	43.7	11.3	24.0
II	31	11.5	18.7	10.4	45.6	10.7	25.0
AMERICAN MEXICAN							
I	95	11.8	17.7	10.8	46.5	12.3	24.7
II	97	11.8	17.7	10.8	46.3	12.3	24.7
AMER. "ASIAN", other than noted above							
I	16	11.1	18.6	9.9	45.0	12.8	25.4
II	24	11.1	18.2	9.5	44.5	12.0	25.6

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

(Ch) Change, Liberalism	(Ma) Material well-being	(WC) Work, and Conformance	(Ind) Individual Effort	(Al) Altruism	(Pr) Success, Prestige	(Co) Competition
6.7	9.2	45.7	11.3	25.7	11.7	12.6
6.7	9.2	45.6	11.2	25.7	11.7	12.6
8.1	10.9	45.9	10.8	24.6	11.3	13.0
7.6	11.0	45.0	10.4	24.3	10.7	12.0
6.5	12.4	45.9	11.7	24.1	11.9	11.3
7.1	11.7	46.2	11.1	24.6	11.7	11.9
8.2	7.4	45.0	9.4	27.6	12.4	11.4
7.8	9.8	46.0	12.2	25.7	12.6	12.2
9.7	16.7	41.7	11.3	21.3	12.7	15.7
9.3	12.3	42.3	11.0	21.0	12.3	14.5
8.8	12.2	43.7	11.3	24.0	12.3	12.9
9.7	10.4	45.6	10.7	25.0	12.4	14.0
7.7	10.8	46.5	12.3	24.7	12.4	13.4
7.7	10.8	46.3	12.3	24.7	12.4	13.3
8.6	9.9	45.0	12.8	25.4	12.3	14.1
9.2	9.5	44.5	12.0	25.6	12.2	13.4

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd
TOTAL OF 3,248 IN-SERVICE TEACHERS (Sample I)	12.0	3.7	16.8	4.7	9.5	4.8	45.9	5.9	11.2	3.7	25.5	3.9
TOTAL OF 3,552 IN-SERVICE TEACHERS (Sample II)	12.0	3.7	16.9	4.6	9.6	4.8	45.8	5.8	11.2	3.7	25.4	4.0

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd
16.8	4.7	9.5	4.8	45.9	5.9	11.2	3.7	25.5	3.9	11.7	3.9	12.8	3.4
16.9	4.6	9.6	4.8	45.8	5.8	11.2	3.7	25.4	4.0	11.6	3.9	12.7	3.4

David G. Ryans
1972

Table 3

LINEAGE GROUPS OF IN-SERVICE TEACHERS (WITH n > 30) REPRESENTED BY RESPONDENTS' SCORES YIELDING MEANS HIGHER THAN GENERAL MEAN (.05 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE) ON SCALES OF THE TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS SCHEDULE G-70/2

Teacher Characteristic Scale	Lineage Groups Yielding Higher Mean Scores (.05 level)
Scales Reflecting Teaching Behaviors, Attitudes, etc.	
(X) "Warm," kindly (teacher behavior)	American Japanese
(Y) "Businesslike," Task Oriented (teacher behavior)	American Negro American Chinese
(Z) Original, stimulating (teacher behavior)	American "European"
(R) "Approving" (favorable attitudes) of Pupils and others	American Japanese
(AV) "Traditional," academic, educational viewpoints	American Negro American Mexican
(PV) "Permissive," non-directive educational viewpoints	American Japanese
(TC) Dedicated to "Teaching"	American Negro American Indian
(SP) Social-Personal Adjustment	American Negro
(VS) Verbal-Semantic Facility	American "European"
(V) "Frank" (in responding); a response-set	American Japanese American "European"
(L) Logical, insightful judgment	American "European"
Scales Reflecting "Values"	
(Re) Religion and associated morality	American Negro
(Ch) Change, Innovation, Liberalism	American Negro American Japanese American Hawaiian/ Polynesian

Scales Reflecting Teaching Behaviors, Attitudes, etc.	Higher Mean Scores (.05 level)
(X) "Warm," kindly (teacher behavior)	American Japanese
(Y) "Businesslike," Task Oriented (teacher behavior)	American Negro American Chinese
(Z) Original, stimulating (teacher behavior)	American "European"
(R) "Approving" (favorable attitudes) of Pupils and others	American Japanese
(AV) "Traditional," academic, educational viewpoints	American Negro American Mexican
(PV) "Permissive," non-directive educational viewpoints	American Japanese
(TC) Dedicated to "Teaching"	American Negro American Indian
(SP) Social-Personal Adjustment	American Negro
(VS) Verbal-Semantic Facility	American "European"
(V) "Frank" (in responding); a response-set	American Japanese American "European"
(L) Logical, insightful judgment	American "European"
Scales Reflecting "Values"	
(Re) Religion and associated morality	American Negro
(Ch) Change, Innovation, Liberalism	American Negro American Japanese American Hawaiian/ Polynesian
(Ma) Material well-being, possessions	American Chinese American Japanese American Mexican American Negro
(Wc) Work, and Conformance	American Negro American Indian
(Ind) Individual effort (as opposed to group effort)	American Mexican
(Al) Altruism	American "European"
(Pr) Success, Prestige	
(Co) Competition	American Negro